

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/643,985	SEKIJIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	G. Nagesh Rao	1722	

**All Participants:**

(1) G. Nagesh Rao.

(2) Edward Meilman.

**Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_**

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 24 January 2007

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

15

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Due to a printer query, examiner called Mr. Meilman to inform him that dependent claim 15 was improperly dependent on itself and needed to be corrected. Mr. Meilman informed Examiner Rao that claim 15 should be dependent on claim 1. Error was corrected in the supplemental examiner's amendment. .